

June 10, 2005



Subject: Docket Number ~~OP-1227~~

Jennifer J. Johnson, Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Systems
20th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20429

Dear Ms Johnson:

The Interagency Proposal on the Classification of Commercial Credit Exposures is inappropriate for nearly all small and medium sized commercial banks. While it is possible to implement this classification scheme in all sizes of institutions, the benefit for small and medium size institutions seems negligible. Loan officers, senior credit administrators, and senior bank managers are very familiar with classified credits in small and medium sized institutions and are very familiar with classified credits in small and medium sized institutions and are able to analyze both the borrower and collateral using the current system. Iowa Division of Banking examiners discuss classified credits with loan officers and bank managers and have a consistent record of accurately identifying loss exposure.

Implementation of this proposal will produce costs for small and medium sized banks that far outweigh the benefits of the proposed classification scheme. Nearly all Iowa state chartered banks have loan watch lists that conform to the current classification system. Implementation of the proposal will require the banks to retool their internal rating systems, credit rating, review, and internal reporting systems currently used by Iowa state chartered banks adequately identify credit exposures. Complete retooling of these systems is unnecessary and a waste of resources.

The retooling of banks' credit administration systems will include rewriting loan policy and procedures, rewriting allowance for loan loss adequacy methodology, rewriting of loan administration and collection procedures, and retraining of personnel to implement the changes. Loan policy will need to be changed to address all of the new terms and nuances generated by the proposal. Credit review procedures will also need to be changed to conform to the new policy. The methodology for analysis of the adequacy of the reserve for loans and lease losses will need to be changed to conform to the proposed classification of commercial credit exposures. At the same time all these additions to policy and procedures are to be added, the old system of analysis, classification and reporting must be retained for real estate, consumer and other non-commercial extensions of credit.

3542 168th Street
P.O. Box 38
Wever, IA 52658
319-372-5141

Website: www.fsbwever.com
E-mail: fsbwever@interl.net

106 Academy Avenue
P.O. Box 276
Denmark, IA 52624
319-528-4222



Member
FDIC

In addition to the immense cost of retooling bank policy and procedures, there will be substantial cost increases for bank regulators. Examination manuals will need to be rewritten, examination report formats will require changes and additions, and examiners will need additional training. Bank regulators will also be required to devote significant time and energy to implementing new policy and procedures.

The examples provided by the proposal clearly demonstrate the additional regulatory burden generated by this proposal. The proposed classification scheme is complicated and burdensome for small and medium sized banks. It may have some merit for large, complex banking organizations whose management and regulators have little or no contact with loan officers and borrowers and limited knowledge of individual problem credits. Burdening the entire banking industry with this new classification system for commercial credit to satisfy a perceived need at a relatively small number of large, complex institutions seems unreasonable and cost prohibitive.

The resultant ratings created from the proposal are no more clear and reasonable than the ratings generated by the current system. Under the current system lenders and examiners analyze credits by looking at all of the factors considered in the proposed system. After analyzing those factors, credits are passed or classified. Almost all bankers and regulators understand the current system. In my experience as a banker, the current system has provided a valid assessment of the risk in bank loan portfolios. This proposal is a solution in search of a problem.

The proposal's treatment of guarantors is almost as reasonable as the rest of the proposal. In my experience as a lender, some guarantors are good and some are not. Predicting the value of a guaranty is similar to predicting the weather: The longer the time horizon of the prediction, the less certain it is.

If the Agencies decide to put additional effort into development of a new classification scheme, they should first perform a cost/benefit analysis on the proposal to determine its value to the industry and regulators. I suggest the proposal should be tested in the largest and most complex banking organizations. If there is some benefit demonstrated throughout an entire business cycle, the proposal might be refined and improved to a degree that its implementation costs could be outweighed by its benefits.

I urge the Agencies to refrain from implementing this proposal. If it is implemented, I urge the Agencies to restrict it to large complex banking organizations. Small and medium sized institutions already bear an excessive amount of regulatory burden imposed by inappropriate and irrelevant federal regulation. There is no valid reason to impose a new commercial loan classification system on small and medium sized banks.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dennis G. Daedlow". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Dennis" being the most prominent part.

Dennis G. Daedlow,
President, CEO & Trust Officer
DGD/jf